

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 17-30 are pending in this application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 17 and 24 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0038]. As such, no new matter has been added

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 17-20, 22-27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Architecture and Application of a Dynamically Reconfigurable Hardware Array for Future Mobile Communications Systems” to Alsolaim et al. (hereinafter “Alsolaim”) in view of United States Patent No. 4,791,603 to Henry (hereinafter “Henry”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

According to MPEP § 2143, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant submits that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every element recited in claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 17-20, 22-27, 29 and 30 and thus they define over the cited references. For example, with respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to teach at least the following language:

a memory unit to store input data for a plurality of functions, wherein each function comprises a computationally intensive communications signal processing task.

According to the Office Action, the above-recited language is disclosed by Alsolaim at section 3.1, 1st paragraph. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over Alsolaim because Alsolaim fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least wherein each function comprises a computationally intensive communications signal processing task. As provided for in the Specification, the function being a computationally intensive communications signal processing task provides the DMVA with the ability to process communication protocol such as IEEE 802.11, IEEE 802.16, etc.

The Office Action states that an operation, as taught in Alsolaim, is equivalent to a function as taught in claim 1. However, Alsolaim merely teaches a simple operation such as addition or subtraction. Alsolaim fails to teach wherein a function is a computationally intensive communication signal processing task. Consequently, Alsolaim fails to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

Henry does not overcome the deficiencies of Alsolaim. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over Henry because Henry also fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least wherein each function comprises a computationally intensive communications signal processing task. Henry teaches fuse maps. Henry fails to teach wherein a function is a computationally intensive communication signal processing task. Consequently, the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

Absence from the cited references of the above-mentioned claim elements negates obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 2, 4 and 7-11 which depend from claim 1, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Independent claims 17 and 24 recite elements similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 24 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 17 and 24. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 18-20, 22-23, 25-27 and 29-30 that depend from claims 17 and 24, respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Claims 5, 6, 21 and 28

Claims 5, 6, 21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Architecture and Application of a Dynamically Reconfigurable Hardware Array for Future Mobile Communications Systems” to Alsolaim et al. (hereinafter “Alsolaim”) in view of United States Patent No. 4,791,603 to Henry (hereinafter “Henry”) and further in view of United States Patent No. 4,862,407 to Fette et al. (hereinafter “Fette”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As recited above, Applicant respectfully submits that Alsolaim and Henry fail to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 24. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Fette fails to remedy the above identified deficiencies of Alsolaim and Henry. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 6, 21 and 28 define over Alsolaim, Henry and Fette, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 5, 6, 21 and 28 that depend from claims 1, 17 and 24 respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 17-30 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants do not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/Rebecca M. Bachner/

Rebecca M. Bachner, Reg. No. 54,865
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: November 28, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529